

Appl. No. : 09/935,789  
Filed : August 22, 2001

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

#### Discussion of Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner made certain objections to Claims 12 and 20. In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that these terms inappropriately use the phrase “is capable of.” Applicant respectfully submits that these limitations have been deleted by the above amendments. Furthermore, Applicant has modified “at least” before “partly” or “in part” for certain of the claims. Applicant respectfully submits by these amendments that there is no narrowing in scope, i.e., the phrase “partly” includes “partially” and also encompasses embodiments that “wholly” include such elements.

#### Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 3-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Prayati, et al., titled “Task Concurrency Management Experiment for Power-efficient Speed-up of Embedded MPEG4 IMI Player” (hereinafter “TCME Paper”). Applicant has enclosed herewith a revised Declaration under 35 U.S.C. § 1.132 and M.P.E.P. 715.01(c)(I) and (II) showing that the Prayati paper is a publication of Applicant’s own invention. In view of this, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

The revised Declaration further clarifies why Peng Yang is not listed as an author of the TCME Paper. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited sections of the TCME Paper are derived from Peng Yang and the other co-inventors. Peng Yang was not listed as an author of the TCME Paper in view of the fact that he did not directly contribute to the actual writing and editing of the paper. However, as is averred in the Declaration, the cited sections of the TCME Paper were derived from Peng Yang and the other inventors, i.e., Francky Catthoor, Peng Yang, Chun Wong, Paul Marchal, Aggeliki Prayati, Nathalie Cossement, and Rudy Lauwreins. Applicant respectfully submits that listing of the authors of the TCME Paper does not reflect who

Appl. No. : 09/935,789  
Filed : August 22, 2001

invented the subject matter described in the paper; but instead, reflect who merely wrote the paper about what had been previously invented and who was the supervisor of the authors.

### Conclusion

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims for patentability purposes, the reasons therefore, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are not made for patentability purposes, and the claims would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments. In addition, such amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims. Rather, these amendments have only been made to increase claim readability, to improve grammar, and to reduce the time and effort required of those in the art to clearly understand the scope of the claim language. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is specifically requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

11/2/2000

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Eric M. Nelson  
Registration No. 43,829  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(619) 235-8550

2912150:sad  
110206